

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. Dox 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

- THE LEGIT NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,728	10/19/2001	Yukari Hashizume	550718-093	7391
27805	7590 12/02/2004		EXAMINER HENDERSON, MARK T	
THOMPSON HINE L.L.P. 2000 COURTHOUSE PLAZA , N.E. 10 WEST SECOND STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DAYTON, O			3722	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		HASHIZUME, YUKAR		
	10/037,728	Art Unit		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	3722		
	Mark T Henderson			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 136(a). In no event, however, may a r pply within the statutory minimum of thir id will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	August 2004.			
2h\ This action is non-tinal.				
or Cines this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the ments is		
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r Ex рапе Quayle, 1935 С.L	y. 11, 400 O.O. 210.		
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	Irawn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) l_l objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance traction is required if the drawin	ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in priority documents have bed areau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper N	w Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI Paper No(s)/Mail Date	B/08) 5) Notice 6) Other:			

Art Unit: 3722

DETAILED ACTION

Faxing of Responses to Office Actions

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)872-9302 (Official) and (703)872-9303 (for After Finals). This practice may be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

1. Applicant has submitted a request for reconsideration of the previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 3722

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1-17 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynton (6,183,158) in view of Ashcraft et al (6,045,161).

Lynton discloses in Fig. 1, a binder insert comprising: a transparent plastic bag shaped body (10) with an open upper side (56); and a plurality of store portions (Col. 8, lines 55-60) which can store photographs, memos, and "one or more leafs or sheets of paper (such store boards),... or the like which may comprises one or more pictures and/or other memorabilia mounted thereon or displayed" (Col. 7, lines 33-40); and a binding section (34) having holes (40).

However, Lynton does not disclose: a pocket placed store board comprising thick paper folded in two and having slits (curvilinear cuts) at a predetermined location; a color paper disposed between facing surfaces of the thick paper; slits in various shapes; and slits which can hold sheets.

Ashcraft et al discloses in Fig. 1-3, a pocket placed store board (36) comprising thick paper folded in two (42 and 46) having a set of slits (44, slits which form the tabs) at a predetermined location; a color paper (34) disposed between the thick paper surfaces.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lynton's binder insert to include a store board comprising folded thick paper having slits, and a inserted color paper as taught by Ashcraft et al for the

Art Unit: 3722

purpose of mounting indicied substrate(s) in a stable position between the folded store board, so as to prevent movement of the substrate(s).

In regards to Claim 1 and 17, it is understood that the process of making store portions can be made by a myriad of processes and that patentability is based solely on the product.

Therefore, dividing the portions can be done by any desirable method.

In regards to Claims 1, 3, 6, 11 and 12, which discloses a store portion for storing memos or photographs; slits being used to insert corner of a photograph and a color paper therebetween; and a color print portion in accordance with the standardized sizes, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Therefore, the store portion is capable of storing memos or photographs, since it is up to the end user of what is to be placed in the store portions; the slits are capable of being used to hold a photograph and a color paper therebetween; and the color prints are capable or providing indication as to the proper slits for various photograph sizes.

In regards to Claims 4, 5, 7-10, and 13-16, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the slits of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. Therefore, it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 3722

to form the slits in any desirable shape, since applicant has not disclosed the criticality of having a particular shape and invention would function equally as well with the slits being in any shape.

In regards to Claims 10, 16 and 17, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the slits at any desirable location, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to place the slits in any desirable location required by the end user, since applicant has not disclosed the criticality of having the slits in a particular location and invention would function equally as well with the slits placed at any location since the slits intended use is to hold and secure a substrate.

In regards to Claims 6 and 12, matters related to the choice of ornamentation producing no mechanical effect or advantage considered to constitute the invention are considered obvious and do not impart patentability. Therefore, it would be obvious to form the paper with any desirable colored paper can be inserted in the slots. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include any desirable amount of substrates to be held by the slits, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include any number of indicied substrates to be held by a set of slits, since applicant has not disclosed the criticality that the slits can only secure a particular number of substrates, and invention would function equally as well with any number of substrates.

Art Unit: 3722

In regards to Claims 1 and 17, wherein the slits (cuts) or used to insert corners of a photograph on an outside surface of the thick paper, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Therefore, the slits of Ashcroft are capable of holding any desirable sheet (such as a photograph) whether directly or indirectly on any side of the thick paper, since the slits (curvilinear cuts) form the tabs which can be bent inwards as well as outward to hold a sheet.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on February 13, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments that neither reference discloses "a memo store portion and a memo paper in the store portion", the examiner submits that the Lynton reference is now used to disclose store portions (pockets) which are capable of storing a variety of items which can include the structure of a "store board". Therefore, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art

Art Unit: 3722

structure is <u>capable of performing the intended use</u>, then it meets the claim. Therefore, the store portion is capable of storing memos or photographs, since it is up to the end user as to what is to be placed in the store portions.

In regards to applicant's argument that the invention discloses store boards, which is not disclosed in the Lynton reference, the examiner submits that applicant has disclosed a "store board" as "a thick paper folded in two, having slits". The Lynton reference clearly discloses that the inserted items can be paper ("paperboard"), and one or more leaves (a "paper folded" can be seen as a two leaves connected at a fold line). Therefore, the Lynton reference satisfies this claim limitation.

In regards to applicant's argument that there is no disclosure "of slits for holding photographs on the outside of the store board", the examiner submits a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Therefore, the slits of Ashcroft are capable of holding any desirable sheet (such as a photograph) whether directly or indirectly on any side of the thick paper, since the slits (curvilinear cuts) form the tabs which can be bent inwards as well as outward to hold a sheet.

Therefore, the examiner's rejections have been maintained.

Art Unit: 3722

Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3722

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark T. Henderson whose telephone number is (703)305-0189. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:45 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, A. L. Wellington, can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax number for TC 3700 is (703)-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.

MTH

November 28, 2004

Daniel W. Howell Primary Examiner Art Unit 3722

Single Homel